

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,306	04/01/2004	Emanuela Keller	KELLER, E. ET AL 1	8572
25889 75 WILLIAM COL	590 01/04/200 LARD	7	EXAMINER	
COLLARD & ROE, P.C. 1077 NORTHERN BOULEVARD ROSLYN, NY 11576			LAURITZEN, AMANDA L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3737	
SHORTENED STATUTORY	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	. DELIVERY MODE	
3 MON	TUC	01/04/2007	DAI	DED

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

·	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Commons	10/816,306	KELLER ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Amanda L. Lauritzen	3737	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
Period for Reply	VIO OET TO EVOIDE A MONTH	0) OD THIDTY (20) DAYO	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>1 Ap</u>	ril 2004		
,	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	•	secution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under E	·		
diosed in accordance with the practice direct 2	in purio quayro, 1000 G.B. 11, 10		
Disposition of Claims	•		
4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	wn from consideration.	•	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	•		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.	;	
Application Papers			·
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).	
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	,		
1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.	•	
2. Certified copies of the priority document		on No	·
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	rity documents have been receive	d in this National Stage	
application from the International Bureau	ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	,	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	d.	
•	•		
Attachment(s)	.		
1) ⊠ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☑ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da		•
3) X Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) D Notice of Informal P		
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 16 Sept 2004.	6)		

Application/Control Number: 10/816,306

Art Unit: 3737

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed German Application No. 103 15 574.0 filed Apr. 5, 2003 is acknowledged under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-9, 11-16, 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pfeiffer et al. (U.S. 6,223,069).

Pfeiffer et al. disclose a device for measuring cerebral blood flow using an injection of indocyanine green as an indicator for near infrared spectroscopy (abstract; col. 2, lines 6-7). The method and Pfeiffer is specific to emitting and detecting radiation at first and second locations, respectively (see measurement through both brain hemispheres cited at col. 2, lines 44-45). The arterial dye curve and cerebral dye curve are taken to be inflow and outflow functions as defined by applicant and inherently correspond to non-pulsatile and pulsatile components of the signal (see arterial and cerebral curves at col. 5, lines 1-10). The optical density is monitored to determine an inflow function according to the change in dye concentration with respect to time (effectively the derivative) in the tissue (col. 4, lines 34-37). The convolution integral defines an outflow function (col. 5, line 10). The mean transit time is specified in determination of the

Application/Control Number: 10/816,306

Art Unit: 3737

inflow function and "varying rates" imply variation of transit times (col. 5, lines 40-49). The process of determining the inflow function is deemed iterative (col. 5, line 19). Pfeiffer et al. disclose using blood flow and mean transit time to determine the volume (col. 8, lines 13-15), with a flow parameter by definition being a quotient of volume and time (col. 5, line 33 for ml/min for a flow transport function). The auxiliary variable of the integral provides a scaling factor (col. 5, lines 10-11). The method of Pfeiffer includes an iterative determination of the inflow function that is represented as a sum of a finite number of functions that are similar in form to the transport function (col. 5, lines 38 for the transport function and line 52 for the summation).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 3, 5, 6, 10, 17, 18 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pfeiffer '069 in view of Boas (U.S. 6,516,214).

Pfeiffer discloses all features of the invention as substantially claimed but is silent with regard to the steps of using a threshold value, extrapolation of a scaled inflow function, and applying a locally increased contact pressure, but in the same field of endeavor, Boas discloses establishing a threshold for dye concentration comparison (col. 3, lines 2-7), extrapolating the position from the scaled inflow function for determining the location of an ischemic event (col. 3, lines 27-39), and applying contact pressure (see flexible cap 400 with rubber grommets 440

Application/Control Number: 10/816,306

Art Unit: 3737

that generates pressure in order to fix the device to the patient's scalp; also col. 10, lines 20-42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the steps of using a threshold value for comparison purposes and extrapolation of data for determining location as taught by Boas with the method of Pfeiffer in order to evaluate an ischemic event (abstract; also col. 3, lines 13-14).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amanda L. Lauritzen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4303. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian L. Casler can be reached on (571) 272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/816,306 Page 5

Art Unit: 3737

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A.L.L.

12/20/2006

ELENI MANTIS MERCADER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER